

873 Broadway
2nd floor south
New York, N.Y. 10003

January 6, 1969

TO ALL NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ORGANIZERS

Dear Comrades,

Chicago Branch Discussion, December 3, 1968

Attached is a transcript of the remarks of the party and youth NCers and the head of the main campus fraction made during a Chicago branch discussion on December 3, 1968. Also attached is a memorandum from Gus Horowitz on the framework of the discussion.

The transcript has not been edited by the participants.

This is for the information of the national committee members and organizers only and not for general membership distribution.

Comradely,

Jack Barnes
Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY
Chicago, Illinois

December 15, 1968

National Office

Dear Comrades,

The enclosed tape is the complete discussion held in the Chicago branch on December 3, 1968. The point on the agenda was membership, under which an Afro-American comrade, Wilbert A., submitted his resignation from the SWP. The branch voted to accept his resignation.

Discussion on the point was organized in an educational fashion to help clarify some of our concepts of the revolutionary party and the necessity of recruitment of black cadres to the SWP.

Wilbert A. had come to the conclusion that the black cadres of a revolutionary party would have to be built outside the SWP, at least at this time. He believed the Black Panther Party was developing as the vanguard party of the black liberation struggle and was the arena in which black Marxists would be developed. He did not think recruitment of black cadres to the SWP was a realizable or necessary task and questioned the validity of building a multinational revolutionary Marxist party.

Accordingly, on his own initiative and without consulting the branch, he joined the Chicago Black Panther Party and decided to function politically as a member of that organization. He stated his primary loyalty was to the BPP. He wanted to work to recruit black militants to that organization rather than the SWP.

After discussion with the branch organizer, it was mutually agreed that his continued membership in the SWP would be incompatible with that perspective.

In the discussion in the Chicago YSA prior to the YSA convention there had been some discussion of the theoretical points that were raised here. At the YSA convention, where Wilbert spoke as a delegate, there was also some discussion of these points. So we assumed the discussion in the Chicago branch should be organized to clarify as much as possible the Leninist concept of the revolutionary party as composed of revolutionaries of all nations, oppressor and oppressed both.

In addition to the members of the Chicago branch, Comrade Derrick Morrison from the YSA NEC agreed to stay over following the YSA convention and participate in the discussion.

The Chicago YSA members were invited to attend the meeting as observers.

Comradely,
s/ Gus Horowitz

CHICAGO BRANCH DISCUSSION, DECEMBER 3, 1968

Wilbert A.: I guess everyone has figured it out by now, I'm resigning from the SWP and the YSA. The reason is not because of any major political difference, it's mostly because of where I can work, and where I cannot work, because of organizational problems. What I'll be doing is probably spending most of my time working with the Black Panthers, and I would have to begin organizing a section of the Black Panther Party at U. of Illinois.

In the nationalist movement these days, there develops this idea about black socialism, and what they call revolutionary nationalism, where it's moving farther to the left, along socialist lines. Since we're not recruiting large numbers of blacks to the YSA, my perspective is that the best thing that could be done is to go into the Panthers and try to develop sort of semi-Marxist or Marxist cadres within the Panther Party which I see as the most realistic perspective right now.

From what I've been able to see so far from the Panthers, they're growing quite fast, and all that sort of stuff, but they have made quite a few political errors. People have criticized the Panthers, but there haven't been any black Marxists within the Panthers to try to correct some of these errors that they have made. People stand on the sidelines and talk about criticizing on organizational questions. We should be in it, and trying to build it, and correct some of those errors.

And the Chicago Panthers, I guess, is one of the most healthy chapters in the nation. The chapter here didn't go by the decision that was made in Oakland all the way, around that Cleaver campaign, the whole Peace and Freedom thing, they just sort of ignored it. So, what I'd be doing is working full time in the Panthers, and I guess more discussion could go on later about this whole idea about recruiting black people to the YSA and developing Marxist cadres in the YSA. That's good for a long term objective, though, maybe that's good for five or six years, as radicalization deepens in this country, where you might be able to bring some in. But in the meantime, as the development of the nationalist movement in this country deepens as a mass movement, there's less chance of recruiting anybody black into the YSA, nationalists, that is. You might be able to recruit blacks, I wouldn't doubt that at all. But I'm saying that there's a lesser chance of recruiting real nationalists.

Then another thing I noticed in the YSA, not the YSA, just the movement in general, is that, we have [black] people who seem to have lost touch with the nationalist movement at times. Especially when people are speaking to a group of students it seems they can't communicate and cut across that barrier when they're talking to you. This is something that has to be corrected. We intend to make an impact, and recruit nationalists. You have to be able to communicate with people; if you can't communicate with people, then you can't even talk to them. That's become a serious problem with [black] people who are more or less recruited into all

white organizations. And, the only way I can see that this error can be corrected, is by [black] people working within these organizations, working among their own people, to help build a revolutionary nationalist movement, and not losing so much contact with their community and with their people. So that's the main reason I'm resigning, because I see that the Black Panther Party is probably the vanguard nationalist party in this country, and they will probably become a mass revolutionary party -- that's my perspective. I don't think the SWP wholly agrees on that, and that's the main reason I'm resigning. I have political disagreement mainly around the Black Panther Party.

Rich Hill (youth national committee, branch organizer)
Statement for the branch executive committee: As Wilbert said, and didn't say, the discussion here is over a serious question. That is, the disagreement is not over the tactical question of whether to go into the Black Panthers or not, whether to support the Black Panthers or not, but the question here is basic, a key question for the revolutionary party, that is -- whether we should try to build a multinational Marxist party to lead the revolution in this country. That is, whether that remains, or does not remain our central perspective, and whether we should, or should not try to build, as an integral part of that party, a black Marxist cadre which can intervene in the struggle for self determination and develop revolutionary Marxist leadership.

Now what we wanted to do this evening is to devote some time to this question to begin to clarify some things. The whole context of the discussion and the implications for the party are very important to go into. Now these disagreements, as I mentioned, on the nature of the party, and the kind of party we're building, are not in themselves sufficient reason to resign or drop from membership. But when they go on to involve the question of discipline, the discipline of our party and the question of loyalty to the party and the organization, it becomes something very important to deal with. In this case, the political disagreements are such that, for Wilbert, as he's expressed it, his loyalty to the Black Panther Party comes first. And he has a developed political perspective on why this is the case. We understand in the Socialist Workers Party for a very good reason, that in order to build a revolutionary combat party, a revolutionary Marxist party, that its line must be homogeneous. The question of discipline and organizational loyalty flow from that, and it's very important that the party remain constructed on this basis, in order to actually carry out its revolutionary program. Because we recognize that Wilbert has very serious political differences with the Party, we mutually reached the decision to accept Wilbert's resignation. This came up at the YSA convention, where Wilbert raised the question on the floor of whether a multinational revolutionary party was really possible, and should be built in this country and how that affects the building of a revolutionary Marxist cadre.

Now, what kind of party are we trying to build, what kind of party can actually lead the American working class to power -- something which is no small task, to be taken lightly. The conception of a revolutionary Marxist party organized along democratic centralist lines was developed by Lenin in order to deal with the problem of facing a centralized ruling class, which uses all the available means of violence in order to protect its power. In order for the workers to overcome and seize power from the capitalists, they need a combat party of their own, which reflects their own interests in that class struggle. They need a party which not only reflects their own interests, but which is capable of acting as a centralized unit in that revolutionary struggle.

Lenin also developed the Marxist approach to national minorities, who suffer from racial and national oppression as well as class oppression. That is, the Bolshevik party served to coordinate these struggles as well, recruiting the best revolutionists from the oppressed nationalities to the Bolshevik party itself. The Bolshevik party was seen by the Bolsheviks as a vanguard party, which could coordinate the struggles of all revolutionary elements within society and which could unite them in the struggle to eliminate the capitalist system itself. And that conception of revolutionary organization was borne out in the making of the Russian Revolution. We carry out that conception today in our task of building a party that can lead the American revolution. Within the United States, we understand that there exist conditions of national oppression of blacks, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Indians. The job, then, of defeating and removing American capitalism, is that of coordinating the revolutionary struggle of all oppressed peoples within the United States against the capitalist system, the struggle of the oppressed peoples within the United States in alliance with the working class struggle.

The experiences of the world working class movement have shown that this struggle must be carried out through a party grounded in the theory of Marxism. The program of Marxism, of Trotskyism, is the only consistent program which brings the experiences of over 100 years of struggle against capitalism to young revolutionaries today. It is the only program which helps us to avoid the mistakes and defeats of the past. It is multinational because the struggle against national oppression is the struggle against capitalism itself. This struggle is best carried out around a common revolutionary program, and a common democratic centralist organization. This is what we've learned, especially over the last 50 years.

Now, in addition we recognize that Afro-Americans will play a vanguard role in the American revolution. That due to their dual racial and class oppression, we see blacks as the first and the most militant in the struggle against capitalism, as playing the most advanced role in the revolution itself and the development of that revolution. It's for this reason that revolutionary

Marxists should pay extra attention to the recruiting and developing of a black Marxist cadre in the SWP and the YSA. The purpose of our revolutionary party is to develop a capable political leadership that is the cadre which can intervene in the struggles under capitalism, which can fight for a program which can mobilize the masses in struggle along lines which educate the masses that capitalism must be destroyed. We have a perspective of building a black cadre within our party, of intervening in the black struggle, of doing contact work among black militants to acquaint them with our program and to recruit them to our organization.

Our experience in the last period in Chicago itself, and this we saw at the YSA convention, and it has to a certain extent been borne out nationally, is of increasing contact with Afro-Americans who are interested in the YSA as a revolutionary Marxist organization. Our perspective in Chicago as well as nationally should be the development of a black work fraction which can orient towards activity in and support for the struggle for self determination, that can draw revolutionary minded militants in the direction of our Marxist program and organization. And we've got to see this as it is, as a realistic perspective.

I want to emphasize that what's involved here in this discussion is not the question of support to the Panthers. We've shown our support both in our program and in our actions -- through our election campaign, "Free Huey" work, joint actions along with and in support of the Panthers in various centers, and in our general propaganda work. We welcome emergence of the Panthers as a revolutionary force within the black community, as a force in politicizing and involving growing numbers of black people, especially black youth, in struggle. The Black Panther Party sees itself as becoming the vanguard leadership within the black nation, as Wilbert pointed out. And we recognize that vanguard formations like the Black Panther Party (there will undoubtedly be others) can play a key role in initiating and building what we recognize as the next step in the development of a mass struggle for self determination for the black community. That is, a mass independent black political party which would include in its ranks the masses of Afro-Americans around demands such as black control of the black community, organizing them in a revolutionary direction. In such a party the vanguard revolutionary tendencies would play a key role. And then, in addition, the SWP and the YSA can also play an important role as a vanguard tendency, as a vanguard Marxist tendency in bringing about such a party, and that's our perspective. Thus, we see the Black Panther Party as a fraternal organization, as a potentially great ally in educating and developing revolutionary consciousness among Afro-Americans.

We must bear in mind that the reason for a revolutionary Marxist organization is that it is based on the only consistent revolutionary program today, that we can't afford to give over the construction of what we consider to be key, that is the construction

of a revolutionary Marxist black cadre, to vanguard groupings which are not based on a Marxist program, and which have not yet worked out within their organizations that perspective. The BPP has emerged on a national level within the last six months, and we will see considerable developments, and discussions within its own ranks, discussions of various questions including the question of socialism and of what sort of system to replace capitalism with, etc. And we'll see that developing, and we'll play a role in that general discussion within the black vanguard over what kind of program will be needed in order to make the necessary revolution in this country.

Our perspective again is to develop a cadre in a multinational Marxist party and over time to develop the closest relationship with other revolutionary tendencies including those like the Black Panther Party.

We recognize, as has been shown in the history of the development of working class parties, that the revolutionary party will be built through splits and fusions and discussions and disagreements and through a process of clarification in order to draw together the cadre that can actually intervene in a role of leadership in the mass movement. And it's our perspective to be able to demonstrate in action, to vanguard militants both now and through all sorts of struggles that will lead up to the American revolution, the necessity and the superiority of such a party that we are trying to build.

It's a tactical question whether, in a certain period, we work inside revolutionary nationalist formations like the BPP, or we don't. We have no such mechanical view toward these groupings, that we say automatically upon their emergence we enter them. There's a lot of factors there which need to be taken into consideration, such as the size of our own cadre, such as where the leadership in these nationalist formations comes from, and what is the effect of something which might be seen as entrism, and the relationships with this party. There's a lot of considerations that we take into account, in gauging our relationship with these formations, and at this time, due to reasons that I mentioned, our perspective is not to enter the BPP, though we're not opposed in principle to working inside these formations. Now our perspective is to work to support and help defend the BPP and other such formations that are moving in a revolutionary direction, and to develop as well as possible common actions where agreed upon with these formations. We believe that in so doing over a period of time, that we'll be able to demonstrate why the revolutionary party, which is a multinational party, is the logical and most efficient, and best way of building a revolutionary leadership which can end capitalism.

Wilbert mentioned that there hadn't been much recruiting of Afro-Americans to the YSA or the SWP over the last period, and that's undeniably true. But what we shouldn't take from that is

any defeatism whatsoever -- that because we haven't, we can't. That's not true. That's not true unless we can find elements within our program that serve to prevent us from being able to relate to the black struggle, being able to get out our revolutionary Marxist ideas within the black struggle, being able to interest black militants in building the sort of revolutionary party which we consider key. We shouldn't have a trace of defeatism or skepticism on that account. This is not to say that this small upsurge we see in terms of interest in the YSA and the SWP is going to be a steady continuous thing which will not have dips and rises like everything else, but that over a period of time, we will be able to demonstrate our program within the black movement, within the general working class movement as well, in order to recruit the vanguard elements, revolutionary militants, within these mass struggles.

Dan Styron (party national committee): Well, what we're talking about is really a very high level question, of where revolutionists should operate. Simply because it's an organizational question and not what would be technically called a programmatic question, a difference in basic political perspective -- that doesn't in any way decrease its importance. You see, the transition between capitalism and socialism is only an organizational question. It's a question of how you organize society differently. That's all it is. For example, there was no programmatic difference between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, none at all, they had the same program, only an organizational difference on how you construct vanguard organizations.

The organizational differences shouldn't be very quickly brushed aside by saying, well, you know, revolutionists should work where they can. That's good - but that's just insufficient, and the reason it's insufficient is simply because in any serious social struggle there will be millions of people in the United States, forced into struggle simply to defend themselves. They're going to be up against a very highly centralized opposition, and if the revolutionists find themselves at the highest levels of command having several points of leadership I'd say it's virtually guaranteed that they will lose, it's almost for certain. There's military history -- don't forget that the most important reason the Red Army won the Civil War is that the counterrevolutionaries could not build a unified command. In the American Civil War, the reason that the Union was unsuccessful in having big military victories in the first part of the war was that the South had a unified command, and the North did not have a unified command. You can go through any military analogy to the question, and in the final analysis important political questions are decided militarily and the question of a unified command is absolutely central. When you don't have a unified command and have only close collaboration among people who generally have the same approach, it is impossible to win, especially given the speed with which any important revolutionary development will hit the United States.

There's not much time for collaboration.

Another thing to be wary of on this whole question is the American exceptionalism approach. In most countries you have oppressed national minorities. It's an exceptional country where you don't have a strong oppressed national minority. In Canada, obviously, in England, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, wherever you want to go -- Finland -- you have very important oppressed national minorities, and it's an international question of how you relate to them. It's a very exceptional country that has no oppressed national minorities. So, how do you relate to that? And the general approach that Lenin basically is the author of, was that the revolutionists had to organize themselves not on the basis of the way their national backgrounds happened to be laid out, but according to the way the ruling class had itself laid out. That on the general strategy, the world goes socialist by countries. And so the strategy and organization and approach towards successful national revolutions, which taken together become an international revolution -- the simplest way to understand it, the most correct way to understand it, is in military terms.

If you're going to wage incredibly complicated, ruthless struggle against an opponent, you at least have to have the same degree of centralization as the opponent has. What it comes down to in the United States is simply this, that in a serious revolutionary situation in the United States, the ruling class is going to be organized out of the East Wing of the White House. A small group of people are going to call all the tactics, 8 or 9 or 10 guys. That's the way they run the Vietnam war. There's not going to be a lot of collaboration and confusion and like that; they're going to run it in a very centralized and disciplined way, with their staff, that they've learned during years and years to rely on, and trust. The revolutionists have to have the same degree of centralization. They have to be able to successfully politically compete against the extremely high level of competence and organization that the ruling class has at its disposal.

Now a lot can be achieved, an awful lot can be achieved through purely nationalist organizations, by doing things organizationally incorrect. But it depends on what you want to achieve. That's important to the whole concept of a black party, a tremendous amount of gains can be made, you shouldn't slight that. But you're not going to successfully abolish the state apparatus in the United States through several organizations based on nationalities.

Then the final thing is that making socialist revolutions is difficult, a lot of pressure is brought on the comrades. Well, it's nothing like the position of revolutionists in Germany under Hitler. The pressure the comrades have to be able to expect during the course of important struggles is going to be 100 times greater than anything people experience at the present time.

The most important thing, I think, to keep in mind, is that we're not talking about a peculiar question in the United States. But the general approach would have to be international. I think it would immediately be seen as peculiar if the revolutionists in Israel, for example, were divided up into one group that were Arabs, and one group that was Jewish. If they had the same program, but couldn't get together because they didn't speak the same language; or if the revolutionists in Wales would not come in with the English and Scottish revolutionaries. You know, there are big parliamentary nationalist parties in these countries. It becomes clear when you put it on the internationalist level where you're less swayed by the peculiar social pressures which exist in the United States at the present time. The basic argument in favor of a centralized organization is based on a unity of revolutionists within the nation-states the bourgeoisie has established. Our battle lines correspond to their battle lines.

Literally, it's the highest level organizational question, which finally comes down to a simple fact that unless you can successfully compete against the ruling class and their political and military apparatus, you simply cannot bring about socialism. It's inconceivable, I think, almost theoretically excluded, that you could have a successful socialist revolution, especially in the United States without one authoritative, centralized political leadership, a leadership that has through years and years of collaboration gained trust and authority, both within itself and in the mass of the population. I don't see any other way to win.

Lynn Henderson (party national committee): What is not involved here is not a dispute over a tactical question of whether Wilbert should work in the BPP, or not. If it is his main area of work. The question here is not a dispute over entrism. Now in some periods we would send people into organizations like the BPP, some periods we wouldn't. That's a decision you make on the basis of a political evaluation you have of what the status or situation is now and what are the advantages, what are the disadvantages.

The national feeling how is it would be a mistake to send YSA'ers and SWP'ers into the BPP. There are a number of reasons for this. This isn't the key question, but to just go into it briefly, one of the major reasons is that the BPP are at a very young stage. They are ultra-sensitive of other organizations sending people in there. As a new organization, with a leadership completely in flux, very unsure of themselves, very unstable, very sensitive, especially about other organizations which they define as a white organization -- how would they look at the YSA-SWP sending comrades into the organization? They would look on that as a move on the part of the SWP-YSA to open up a fight for the leadership of that organization. We think that would be a mistake. We think that would result in a deterioration of our relationship with the BPP. They'd look on that as opening up a power fight within their organization, on the part of a democratic centralist organization coming in and

trying to take over their organization.

We feel that we can develop friendly relationships, and have in a whole number of areas, by working with the BPP. We're very close with the BPP in Seattle. In Indianapolis they sell the paper in their headquarters; they look on it as next to their own paper the most important paper in the movement. But this is not the question. Whether we're right or wrong on that decision is not the key question.

See, Wilbert does not have an entrism perspective. The key question is that Wilbert says that the SWP and the YSA is not the organization that's going to develop black cadre. That that's going to be done in the BPP. That's the key question. Wilbert has the perspective, as I understand it, of encouraging all blacks not to join the SWP, not to join the YSA -- but to join directly the BPP. Because that's where the black cadres who will lead the revolution will be made. On this question we have a key political difference. We say that the black movement and the black nationalist movement is a tremendously progressive step and raises a tremendously progressive objective factor of increasing the revolutionary potential in this country. We still have the analysis that the main question today is not the objective situation but a crisis of leadership. And we still have the analysis that a Marxist-Leninist-Trotskyist revolutionary leadership has to be developed in a revolutionary party that is consciously Marxist-Leninist. We say there's only one such party around. And we say that if we're going to succeed and make a revolution in this country, that black cadre have to be recruited to this party, and trained in it. Wilbert has a different perspective on it. He says, no, he doesn't believe that a multinational party is the road to revolution in this country. Blacks will have to be trained somewhere else. Now this is the key difference that's involved here.

The comparison that the ruling class is an extremely centralized organization, so we have to be extremely centralized too, is good, but I don't want to push that line too far. I think you can get into hang-ups by making direct comparisons with the ruling class that way. They've got different kinds of problems. They don't have a democratic centralist type of organization and they run their thing without it. And you can't make too close comparison with it. The key question here and the key dispute here is how is the multinational revolutionary party still valid? Or do we have some kind of American exceptionalism here? We at this point say no. That the key question for making the revolution is still what Trotsky pointed out 40, 30 years ago -- the crisis of leadership exists.

Now where is that leadership going to be constructed? We don't feel that the BPP, with all its revolutionary potential, is going to develop a black cadre that's going to be able to lead the revolution, on its own, or through some kind of osmosis. For instance, make one comparison. People say to me, "Well, we say the BPP is revolutionary, we say the BPP is in the vanguard, and that

black people are going to be the vanguard of the American revolution. Well, then, shouldn't we be in the BPP?" All comparisons are dangerous. The workers in the IWW were the revolutionary vanguard, the IWW was the most revolutionary organization around. But the IWW in its program, and its organizational form, had defects which it could not surmount. And they could not create a revolutionary cadre to lead a revolution in that organization. You have to develop beyond that into something else.

And so an organization can have tremendous revolutionary potential. And be in a vanguard in many sense. But still not be the organization that's going to develop the revolutionary cadre. And we certainly would have been opposed to dissolving the Marxist party into the IWW, or something like that. So the key question here, as I pointed out, is not entrism. We can argue pro or con whether some black comrades should be sent into the BPP. At the present, the party's position is that we think it would be a mistake. That's a tactical question. Wilbert's disagreement goes way beyond that. He says that we shouldn't recruit potential black revolutionaries, that they should join the BPP, and that revolutionary black cadre will be developed in the BPP. He says that the concept that Lenin developed of the multinational revolutionary workers' party, a single revolutionary party to lead the revolution in any single nation-state, is not any longer valid.

Carl Finamore (head of the University of Illinois [Chicago] fraction): We mentioned that all analogies are weak. I don't want to rob you of the essence of what you meant, but first, the comparisons have been naive to the IWW, the Progressive Party. Just to make clear one difference is that they were not nationalist organizations, they didn't have the dynamics of a nationalist organization like the BPP. Also, I'm unclear on a lot of things, but there are a few ideas I have that I'd just like to bring out. But first of all, I'm not sure whether Wilbert rejects the idea of unified command, or whether it is necessary to build a centralized command that will deal effectively in a military manner with the ruling class. I hope he doesn't dismiss that. Because we'd be fools, the BPP or any other vanguard nationalist formation, would be foolish to do so. I even asked Robert Browne about this. He said, I'd be a fool not to make an alliance in action with allies. A unified command sort of intimates that what we're saying when we support the BPP to the extent that some of our members would drop membership in the YSA and SWP to join it, is that this would be splitting forces, going off on tangents, dividing our command -- that's the implication.

I think that's wrong. First of all, we're not in a pre-revolutionary situation. I don't think it's that necessary at all, at this point, to have a centralized leadership of the nationalist movement, and the bi-national revolutionary party which I still respect. And I think we'll ultimately make the revolution, with

an alliance of some sort under a centralized, bi-national revolutionary party. But the centralization does not have to be now. So it is not splitting of forces to build a nationalist organization that has a revolutionary perspective.

This whole thing of isolation; that's a real question. That is a most important question to me. If a comrade takes it upon himself to drop out of an organization, he's asking himself two questions -- I don't know what he's asking, let me say what I'd ask -- I would say first of all, there's things you'd have to do. The problem of the crisis of leadership. We respect that as the highest principle. Where can you build that revolutionary black Marxist leadership? I think it can be built in the YSA. As a matter of fact I think the main responsibility for building black Marxist cadre lies with white comrades. White comrades had better do the recruiting and not rely on black comrades. White comrades had better demonstrate that a white revolutionist is not peculiar or some strange fluke that occurs somewhere, but that the whole organization has white revolutionists, Indian revolutionists, Mexican revolutionists and black revolutionists. We coordinate our activities, and we act on that basis.

But that is not to slight a nationalist formation, that is not to say that Marxist cadre cannot be built independently of our organization, and that is not to say that some of our cadre cannot aid in that development. Marxist cadre can and must be built in the revolutionary party, but you've got a nationalist development like the BPP which is attracting the youth. In my opinion it's going to become a mass formation -- not membership wise -- but in its actions it's going to include masses. It has an apparatus, it has a newspaper, a national office, already, and it's got a program, a transitional program, and it's got this big image, and it's got cadre. A woman from Oakland organized the Des Moines local of the Black Panthers. Des Moines. They're sending people to Des Moines, Iowa. That's consciousness.

The question is, how do you solve the crisis of leadership? Where are you going to do it? And I say you're going to do it in two places -- one in the YSA, and our comrades should stay in here, or if they can be more effective it should be a national decision to send them into the BPP. And if it means a little thing, which I think is a technicality, of dropping their formal ties with the YSA and the SWP, then do it. That's when the question of isolation enters in. And I would suggest very strongly that people attend our forums. SWP educationals should be open to ex-comrades who have that arrangement working. Make every attempt not to lose their isolation, or else it will be useless to a great extent.

Now, that's got to be a cold blooded decision, who goes where. That can't be based on any emotionalism or blood is thicker than water and I'm black and I've got to join this black formation and you're a white organization, so I'm not going to stick with you.

No, we're revolutionists, we're the most conscious, we're the vanguard, especially our black comrades. The vanguard, the most politically conscious beings on this continent. And they've got to make national, collective decisions, of who goes where. Where can white comrades be? There's a black nationalist formation which is going ahead, of a mass character, which makes this question take on a whole greater importance.

Now the question of the size of our cadre was raised. This size would mitigate against entering the BPP, I think Richard said. We're not suggesting that every black member of the YSA join the BPP. Not every black member of our party could join the BPP. Someone said that's a slander. How do you mean that's a slander. Someone said in my defense that Che said that not everyone who wants to be a guerrilla can be one. That's true, and similar to the BPP. Where can people be more valuable in developing leadership? Very many of our most conscious people I would suggest should stay here, in the YSA. The people who would be sent into the BPP would be the ones that could relate to its struggles that are occurring, predominantly, although not actually on campuses.

We're not going to send in people just to fill up the ranks of the BPP. That's stupid. Because if we're going to lose a comrade in our discussions, known as a YSA'er, it's got to be on a basis that he can aid the development of a black nationalist revolutionary Marxist cadre. I've got a lot more to say, but I just want to say that it's not a splitting of forces. I disagree with that 100 percent, and a revolutionary bi-national party will be built. We're going to continue to build it, we're going to have to be realistic, and I'm not being defeatist in saying that we cannot compete with the BPP. I don't think we ever thought we could compete with a nationalist organization for the black youth. We can't do that. Really, until we reach the working class. I don't think we're going to recruit blacks in numbers and in the quality that the Black Panthers will until we reach the working class when we really demonstrate the power of revolutionary Marxism.

The struggles we'll be involved in in the trade unions are really going to be relevant to black workers. Every black man is a worker. Everyone lives in a rotten community. And campus struggles that we're involved in now, not to discredit them, and I'm not going to go that far, because I believe they're correct -- but black people cannot relate to those struggles as they can relate to the Black Panther and nationalist formations. That's why they're flocking to them. To think that we're competing with the Black Panthers in a race to see how many you can get in, is stupid. We should accept the perspective that the Black Panthers are going to grow, and develop revolutionary Marxist cadre. And the YSA is going to grow and get revolutionary cadre. When we reach the working class there's probably going to be an alliance and I don't see how it's going to be avoided, an alliance in action. Just to emphasize the importance,

(of not losing touch. That to me is very important.

Ellis Burruss (youth national committee): I think before you can have a thorough discussion as to what type of party you're trying to build, and what its relationship is going to be with other political organizations, it's necessary to go back a little and discuss first what we mean by a party. What we're dealing with right now is a sentiment in sections of the world, in the underdeveloped countries, a rising sentiment of nationalism. First off, I think it's necessary for comrades, even though it's been said time and time again, to understand that what we're about is internationalism, building an international party.

(It's necessary to understand exactly what we mean by internationalism, and to understand this, I think it's necessary to go a little bit into what we mean by a nation. Now, during the summer school, under one section, Dan gave something on nations. Where did nations come from? All society is divided into classes and is also divided into nations. Now the nations that we see in the world today -- Cuba, Guatemala, France -- whatever it is, these nations were not formed by the boundaries somehow falling from heaven, and then all of a sudden there are nations. National boundaries, to a certain extent, correspond to geographical boundaries. Nations as we see them today are direct products of developing capitalism. A nation was basically a place where a capitalist class could guarantee that its trade relations would be to a certain extent secure; that its armies could make certain that there wouldn't be any revolutions and social uprisings, that there would be laws pertaining to trade in a certain area, so that you could trade a pound of wheat for a pound of oats, and come out somewhere with a good deal, according to the laws of the state. These things are basically what determined where nations came from.

But as capitalism continues to develop, both in technology and travel, it overcomes geographical barriers and develops more international markets. As it develops into imperialism, it tends to cut across national boundaries and to a great extent, you have at the present time a few very powerful imperialist nations in the world that completely subjugate the rest of the nations of the world. Now this is why nationalism in the underdeveloped countries, in the underdeveloped world, can have such a revolutionary potential. Because it directly fights against imperialism. However, nationalism, it must be remembered, that is the desire for a nation to determine its own fate, is not in itself revolutionary. In the fight against imperialism it's a revolutionary goal, but it is not in any sense going to bring about socialism just in and of itself.

(Now what kind of party do you want to have? First of all, what is a party? I think the best definition I've ever seen is in the first section of the ABC of Communism where it's stated that a party is an organization that is formed in order to express and work towards the best interests of a social class. Now all society most

really and concretely is not divided into these nations, but into classes -- social classes, that are determined by the relationship of people in society to the productive forces of that society. This is a very basic thing. World society is divided into classes, and the various parties in the world are organized to work towards the best interests of these classes. Taking this into account, a class party is by definition an international party.

A party that is struggling solely for the bourgeois democratic right of national self determination, against imperialism, will fail in its struggle unless it becomes a class party, an international class party, and wages a class war. Now this gets into permanent revolution, and the necessity of developing a struggle to achieve its end of national liberation and the other goals of national liberation like Cuba, the necessity for it to develop into a social revolution.

I want to read something out of Che Speaks. In 1959 in an interview, Che says on p. 13, "The Cuban revolution was not a class war; it was just a war of national liberation." Now, he was obviously wrong on this, and he realized this himself because a few pages later he contradicts that exactly. His future development indicates that, and also the development of the Cuban Communist Party and the Cuban revolution as a whole, which bears out the theory of the permanent revolution.

Now, what we're trying to do, what we've been saying all along, is that we're partisans of building an international working class party, even though because of the Voorhees Act we cannot be a section of an international organization. This is where I disagree with the formulation talking about a bi-national party or a multinational party when you're talking just about the United States. I think that all that's necessary to say is to reaffirm that we're building an international party. Now, it's necessary for an international working class party to work in cooperation with nationalist organizations that are moving in a progressive direction with a perspective of developing these revolutionary nationalist parties into revolutionary internationalist parties, revolutionary Marxist organizations. Questions of organizational affiliation with one or another international organization will be settled once political clarity and agreement is gained, at which time national boundaries become secondary, because it's understood what national boundaries are, and that class boundaries are much more important than national boundaries. Now it's this basic misunderstanding of the importance of the division of world society into classes, rather than division of world society into nations, that has caused all of the defeats that the socialist movement has seen in the past years.

Specifically on our relation with the Panthers. Our position is -- and I think it's come out very clearly in our propaganda and our talks -- to support and work to build the Panthers. I don't think there should be any confusion about that. That's what we're for, is to support and build the Panthers. Now there are other alternatives to this; we could stand aloof from the Panthers, and just

ignore them or we could concentrate on criticizing the Panthers in our press and our talks. Or we could just say the Panthers are totally secondary, that the cultural revolution in China is a much more important issue in the U.S. There are any number of other positions we could take, but our position right now is to support and build the Panthers.

Now what Marxists would be doing should we decide to enter the Panthers, would be to develop a Marxist caucus within the Panthers, and fight to attain control of that organization. This would be entry work. I don't think that would be correct. For one reason, it's not the best way to develop friendly relationships with the leadership of the organization when they know that you're coming in to take over. Secondly, I think that we must realize that the Panthers, as the most revolutionary and most conscious expression of the fight for black liberation right now, are still an organization that is based on national liberation. This has to be taken into account. So I think our best perspective is to continue to build an international working class party that works along with nationalist parties that are developing in a correct direction, with the perspective of what I said before.

Gus Horowitz (party national committee): We have three inter-related discussions, as was mentioned before. One is on the character of the BPP -- whether it's a vanguard formation, whether it will develop into a mass black political party, whether it will develop in a Marxist direction in the broad sense of the term. Another question is the tactical orientation of our party to the BPP -- whether or not black members of the SWP should enter into the BPP and work within it, or whether our work should be outside of it. And the third, the most important point and the one which has been the axis of this discussion, is the character of the revolutionary Marxist party itself, which is one of the fundamental questions in our program.

Wilbert mentioned that one of his aims in joining the Panthers is to try to develop Marxist cadre within the Panthers. And Carl developed this general conception a little bit further, that is that what we mean by the crisis of revolutionary leadership is the lack of Marxist cadres; we need to develop a sufficient number of Marxist revolutionary socialists. Well, that's not what we mean by the crisis of revolutionary leadership. We say that the objective situation of the world socialist revolution has existed for many, many years. There have been revolutionary situations that have taken place in numerous countries and yet many of these situations have not resulted in successful socialist revolutions because of the crisis of revolutionary leadership. What we meant by this is not that there weren't a sufficient number of Marxists, people who thought they were Marxists, or individual cadres who thought they were revolutionaries, or people who thought they were revolutionary socialists, or people who thought they were Leninists, but that the crisis of leadership was that there was not a revolutionary socialist party,

an organization with a program adequate to the task of achieving that socialist revolution.

There's a difference between so many individuals who consider themselves to be Marxists, with varying degrees of really being Marxists, and those same number of individuals actually working together in a democratically centralized manner within a revolutionary socialist party. We together as individuals can only do so much, but together in an organization, we're able to accomplish a lot more. The crisis of revolutionary leadership and the central task for the world socialist revolution is the development of a revolutionary socialist Marxist Trotskyist Leninist vanguard party, which will lead the revolution. That's the task which we have in the United States and throughout the world as a fraternal part of the world revolutionary socialist party. And so it's not a question of where you can develop Marxists, or where you can develop Marxist cadre. The question is how to build a revolutionary Marxist organization, a party. That's where a fundamental line of difference exists.

Now the character of the party as an international, multi-national vanguard organization is not one which someone has thought up simply as a good idea and so on. To the contrary, as has been mentioned by a number of speakers, the character of the party is one which is imposed upon it, imposed on the working class by the nature of the capitalist system and the tasks of building a new system, a socialist society. Capitalist rule throughout the world has specific national characteristics that may differ from country to country. In the colonial world and in the United States the axes of emphasis of the single revolutionary program may vary, but the general nature of capitalism has also imposed general international tasks upon the working class, a single program before it for the overthrow of capitalism. The reason why you have a single organization is because you have a single program. We don't have a program that's different from the program of the revolutionary Marxists in Africa or in Asia or in Latin America, or in the Soviet Union, or in Czechoslovakia, or in France -- that program is the same. We all have the same program -- the transitional program. The program takes on different specifics in different sections of the world. The struggle for national independence, democracy and land reform aren't crucial revolutionary demands within the United States as they are in the colonial world, but these are all part of the international socialist program. There is a single organization because there is a single program. A world party is not a federation of different sections. It's a centralized organization, a democratic centralized organization and not a federation where each national grouping has autonomy in its national area. There is one program which every member of the world party of the socialist revolution carries out, although there are different concrete national strategies, emphases of application in different countries in the world and in different sections of the same country. In other words, the tasks of the world working class are both separate and interconnected at the same time. Separate and interconnected. And while, because of

the Voorhees Act, the SWP cannot affiliate to a world party, we are in full ideological and fraternal solidarity with the Fourth International.

We're aiming for an international society, with no nation state boundaries as exists under capitalism. At the same time the struggle takes place within different national states and in a single national state there are different sides and aspects to the struggle. So there is one party of the revolutionary vanguard with a program applying to the separate and interconnected aspects of the class struggle, both internationally and within a single nation. That is why for instance the seemingly contradictory demand of nationalism has a revolutionary content. The nationalism of oppressed nations has a revolutionary content which will lead toward the elimination of oppressive nationalism and nation states itself.

So our task, as we've already said, is to develop within one organization internationally, and in its national sections or fraternal organizations revolutionary Marxists of all sections of the society, of the oppressed nations and revolutionary Marxists of the oppressor nations as well, in one party, to coordinate the single program of struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution. That is, it's not sufficient merely to develop individual Marxist cadres but you must develop Marxists who are all members of the same revolutionary organization. The organization which has the program for the American socialist revolution. So in this sense, Wilbert's decision to resign from the party is a step away from a fundamental concept which we have always had.

The question then is, will we be able to develop and to recruit black revolutionaries as members of the revolutionary socialist party, the Socialist Workers Party? There is an uneven development of the building of the revolutionary party, and recruitment to the party takes place in different ways in different times. We are going through a period right now where we're recruiting one by one. But in the accumulation of individuals joining the party there will be times when we recruit through fusions and joining together with other groupings, including groupings of black revolutionary-minded militants, who are looking toward the building of a revolutionary party. Now there's a difference. We sometimes use the terms "Marxist" and "socialist" and "revolutionary" in a very broad sense, which is okay. That is, there are revolutionaries throughout the world fighting, there's people who consider themselves Marxists throughout the world, fighting, and in that broad sense, yes, there is a very large revolutionary movement. But there is a distinction between revolutionaries, and revolutionaries in the revolutionary organization. There's a distinction and an important difference there.

Now, we can be sure that there will develop outside of our ranks black militants who consider themselves Marxists, who haven't

yet fully accepted the one crucial point of the revolutionary Marxist program, that is the need for a revolutionary party, an international, revolutionary Marxist party. Our task will be in some form or another, to fuse with, or to recruit these individuals or groupings of individuals into one organization because it will have one program. When you have the development of black revolutionaries who come to agree with us in our program, then the problem of joining together in a single organization isn't so deep a problem as it may seem right now when that situation doesn't yet exist. And the only way that we will be able to recruit and fuse with such revolutionary-minded black socialist revolutionaries in the broad sense of the word is by being organizationally very flexible and collaborative, working together in the course of the struggle. At the same time, in terms of our ideas, our program must be 100 percent firm politically. We can't give a single inch on this fundamental aspect of our program; otherwise we'll never be able to build the revolutionary party. You can only build it by being 100 percent firm politically and by being organizationally very flexible. The test of our theory, as with all theories, is going to be in practice. It's going to be in what happens. And that's the only real test in the long run of how you will be able to build a revolutionary organization.

Now this discussion is a significant discussion for us, because it reflects two things. This discussion and the one we had at the YSA convention, and which will be continuing, reflects first of all a growing radicalization in the black community. More and more numbers of black militants are coming to consider themselves socialists or Marxists or revolutionaries. That's a very important development, and something which we are for 100 percent. And secondly that brings with it also the development of formations within this vanguard in the black struggle, like the BPP, and other organizations. This is also a very important and progressive development, which we support 100 percent. The beginnings of the possibility for us to recruit black revolutionaries into the revolutionary party is also a very good development.

We don't see the Panthers as a competitor to the revolutionary Marxist vanguard party; the two are different types of organizations. The BPP is not the revolutionary socialist vanguard party, although they are a vanguard organization in the black liberation struggle. So we support them and work together with them, and we don't see a competition with them. Our task as always will be to try to recruit black militants into our organization. There will be a time when in these vanguard organizations in the black struggle, and in other struggles, the revolutionary party will play a leadership role through its cadres within that organization. That is, I make the distinction between Marxist cadres playing a leading role within such an organization, and the party playing a leading role in such an organization.

Just as we see in the antiwar movement, there's no contradiction between having mass actions, or a vanguard organization, having a revolutionary Marxist leadership or partially having a revolutionary Marxist leadership which leads in carrying out mass actions of a sort. The antiwar movement has partially a revolutionary Marxist leadership in the person of the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance. There is no contradiction between those mass organizations that carry out mass actions and ourselves.

Now, one final point. I want to repeat something Richard said. And that is, that in terms of the specific situation with Wilbert, that Wilbert has a fundamental political disagreement with us, which makes his first loyalty not towards the building of the revolutionary socialist party, but towards working within the Black Panthers. It is for good intentions, but still, the fact remains that his first loyalty is not towards the revolutionary party and for that reason it is incompatible with membership in the SWP. But the members of the Socialist Workers Party have the responsibility and the obligation, and the YSA members who are members of the SWP especially must have that obligation since the convention has voted on and passed our line as being one of aiming to recruit black militants to our organization, to carry out that line in practice, whatever variations of opinion, agreement, disagreement there are.

Derrick Morrison (youth national executive committee): I just have a few remarks to make; first I want to deal with tactics and second with strategy. In regard to our policy with the BPP, the role that black YSAers play in respect to that organization has been discussed out in relation to the experiences we have had, and we have come to the decision that on the basis of the forces we have that we shouldn't commit then to the Panther Party. We're not strong enough to intervene effectively in the development of the Panther Party at this time. This is a tactical question. It's been helped by the fact that the Panthers have a clause which says that you can't belong to other political organizations and belong to the Panther Party. In some areas they may be flexible on that clause, but that clause does exist. And because of that, and because of the experiences that we've had with black comrades trying to enter the Panther Party, at present, that's not the tactic that we're going to pursue.

Back in 1964, when the Freedom Now Party was launched, that is, when the call was put out for an independent black political party called the Freedom Now Party, we did have enough forces in Detroit, Michigan at that time to not only enter and participate in the party, but actually to get the thing off the ground, that is, as a black party. And it was through the intervention of black SWPers that the Freedom Now Party in Detroit took form and grew. It was the result of recruitment of nationalists to that perspective of building the black political party at that time. And we participated in that party.

The decision not to enter the Black Panther Party at this point raises a question in regard to strategy in a sense: the view of most white radicals (and I use the term white radicals not as a physical description but as a political description in the sense of people who have a certain outlook) and most nationalists, is to see the class and national struggles as one which will develop parallel -- that is, white radicals will work in the white community and develop revolutionary organizations, and black nationalists will work in the black community and develop revolutionary organizations and along the way they will form alliances and eventually will overthrow the state.

That's a very mechanical view of the class and national question. We deal with the whole class and national struggle from the dialectical point of view. That's what distinguishes us from the general radical and nationalist milieu in which we work. Because we deal with it dialectically, that is, we understand the indivisible relationship between the class struggle and the national struggle -- that one cannot succeed without the other. Our understanding of that indivisible relationship between nationalism or the struggle for national liberation and the struggle to end exploitation, the class struggle -- that's reflected in the way we see the construction of an organization to deal with those struggles. That's why we attempt to form a multinational, revolutionary socialist party. And this is not something that is just going to struggle along class lines, developing the class struggle, but it's also something that will be necessary in order to attain black liberation.

Because generally today nationalist organizations are in one place, and revolutionary socialist organizations are in another place, we tend to compartmentalize, and to see in this a parallel development, when in practice, that is, in historical practice, that has not been the case. The way we understand the situation in this country and the situation in the world, is that the question of liberating oppressed nations (which in this country would include black people, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Indians) -- the liberation of those oppressed nations revolves around the whole question of building a nationalist organization. In fact, to be a consistent nationalist, you'd have to be related to the building of a revolutionary Marxist party. That's been a historical experience. If we study the events in Russia, Russia was a nation that was nationally oppressed, yet to liberate Russia from the status of an oppressed nation, required the building of a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party. Not just the building of a nationalist organization. But the whole concept of national liberation was expressed through the building of that party.

That's why you had the development of the struggles in China and North Vietnam the way you did. They attempted to build a nationalist organization in China. In fact, that was the line of the Third

International from 1920 to 1925. That is, Chinese Communists were to work within the Kuomintang which was the Chinese nationalist organization at that time, and attempt to construct a Chinese Communist Party out of that. And not to work at building the Chinese Communist Party. The way it turned out, with the debacle in 1927 -- that wasn't the correct way to go. And the subsequent liberation of China depended on the building of the Chinese Communist Party, just as the subsequent liberation of Vietnam depended on the building of the workers party, the Vietnamese Communist Party. That's where most of the consistent nationalists in Vietnam and in China found themselves. If they were consistent about real national liberation, they found themselves in a vanguard Marxist party.

That's the way the struggles have developed. But because of the fact that you had the degeneration of the Russian revolution and subsequent degeneration of the Third International, what you had after World War II is a whole series of struggles that have been organized just along nationalist lines. This is the case in the third world. You see the rise of nationalist governments, nationalist organizations, in Africa, and somewhat in Asia, with Indonesia, Burma, Thailand, and what have you, and also somewhat in Latin America, but as we see the development of these nations, and in dealing with the tasks that confront these nations, we find that they've not been too successful in dealing with the problems of the third world. That's because they looked at it from a purely nationalist point of view, as if independence would suffice to solve their problems.

But nationalism just wasn't enough. Nationalism just defined as independence. But what was needed was a more defined conception of the political and economic and social realities of the third world. And so now you have the attempt to build revolutionary Marxist vanguard parties in these countries whether it be through guerrilla warfare, or through some other method. That is what's going on now. And the struggles there throw light on the struggles in this country. The liberation of the black nation, the liberation of the Puerto Rican nation, the liberation of the Mexican-American nation, will in the end revolve around the building of a revolutionary Marxist party which embraces nationalists from the Puerto Rican, Mexican-American and black nations, who are Marxists within it. These developments of nationalism within the black community are good, and we support them. In fact we have laid the basis for them in some ways. By getting across our literature, getting across the Militant, and Young Socialist, getting across our whole thing on the black party -- that helped pave the way for the Black Panther Party. The whole experience of the Freedom Now Party helped pave the way for the Black Panther Party.

The BPP is only an embryonic organization. An embryonic step toward the construction of an independent black political party. It's not the end; it's the beginning. The BPP itself is just an organizational reflection of the radicalization of black students,

the radicalization of black youth. Had you not had that radicalization among black students, the BPP would have been impossible. And the BPP is just one form of organizational expression of that youth radicalization. The BPP doesn't embrace every radicalizing youth, every radicalizing black nationalist. And based on that, we attempt to recruit to our organization those revolutionary black nationalists who are beginning to deal with socialist ideas and who want to become revolutionary socialists. The reason we can't relate to a lot of the rank and file that the Panthers recruit is that they're recruited simply on the basis of being nationalists. They begin to develop some sort of an idea of sympathy for socialist ideas as a result of the Panther Party leadership. But the Panther Party is just one channel through which that radicalization is going. We expect to recruit, and we are in the process of recruiting black militants, black nationalists who consider themselves socialists. So that's our perspective.

At the same time that we have this perspective, we are still pushing the idea of the independent black party, attempting to get out our literature, and to convince the masses of black people of that idea. So it's a question of carrying out the task of propagating the building of an independent black party but at the same time seeing the key task of any revolutionary in this country as the building of a multinational revolutionary Marxist party. And that in the end will determine the question of whether any oppressed nation is liberated in this country.

Syd Stapleton (youth national committee): I just want to say something briefly on one point that came up: that is, I don't think it's quite adequate to say that we have an international program and an international party and therefore it follows that the national sections or fraternal groups will be homogeneous. You see, the French section of the Fourth International is not analogous to the N.Y. local of the SWP. Obviously there are clear differences between different national parties. They have independent organizations and independent leaderships, they work in the closest cooperation in fighting a common enemy which is world imperialism, but at the same time there are distinct national parties.

But the reason that that exists is that imperialism is unable to overcome some of the more reactionary aspects of capitalism. That is, there's a French bourgeoisie, which is distinct from the American capitalist class. That is, there's a French ruling class that oppresses French workers in a particular way, and an American capitalist class that oppresses American workers in a particular way just because of the peculiarities of the geographical situation and because of certain national economic differences that developed over time.

But there's no section of the American capitalist class distinct from other sections that oppresses black workers. The historical enemy of black and white workers is an identity. It's one entity;

it's the American ruling class. Now, I don't think that in the course of fighting that enemy that there's any contradiction between nationalism and an organizational unity in that struggle against a single enemy. That is, I don't even think that nationalism is going to be able to develop in its fullest political sense until after the American revolution when it loses its political necessity.

I think that all the points about the problems of recruitment have been made very well, and also the point of the tremendous gap in consciousness between black and white workers, the racism of white workers and the problems that creates in the organization of a multinational party.

On the tactical question of entry, that is entry of revolutionary Marxists into another organization, the best way that that can be organized, if that is the correct tactical position, is to organize that on a national scale with the apparatus that a revolutionary Marxist party is able to provide. That is, national press, national coordination of activities, national organization of the various political interventions that will be made from time to time. It seems to me, if the time comes when we'd want to do that type of work in the BPP, that would be the way to do it.

Summary Statements

Wilbert A.: As far as recruitment is concerned, there might be a problem at U. of Illinois. No one could expect me to recruit people to the YSA at the U. of Illinois this next quarter. I couldn't do it last quarter. We tried last quarter; we couldn't do it. But next quarter will be an entirely different thing. If you can recruit individuals into the YSA and SWP, if the person wants to join, we won't put any pressure on them and tell them not to join. That's not our business. We'll try to recruit people into the Black Panthers the best we can. And go ahead and build the Panthers at U. of Illinois.

This whole thing about bi-national party and national(ist) party, I don't think is really too important. Because, when people begin to fight for their freedom, as the development of the nationalist movement in this country gets larger, whether the white working class moves or not, black people are going to move. The nationalist movement is going to grow. You don't have to be a genius to see that. Just look around. These people just don't seem to be jiving. And Syd said that he doesn't think the nationalist feeling of the black community will come out until after the revolution. Probably after the revolution, nationalist feeling will die down -- there'll be no need for it. I think you'll see it before the revolution. That's what makes people fight. When they look at the common oppressor, the capitalist. People like Robert Browne, even.

If you're Marxists, you've got to be able to apply your politics, you've got to be able to organize people. If you can't do that, forget it. If you're going to be an intellectual, and not be able to organize people in the black community, forget it; you're out of it. People who are black Marxists are going to have to seriously think about that question. They're going to have to seriously think about working in the BPP and around the BPP, building a mass revolutionary nationalist party. Not only nationalist; I think a large section of it will become Marxist. I'm sure of that. And people will have to seriously think of that question. You're not going to be able to influence nationalists by writing an article in the Militant, and criticizing them. You're not going to influence anybody that way. The way you're going to influence people is by setting the example working among them, help build their organization. Setting the example that others can follow.

Che once said that what he considered the revolutionary party was the party in the forefront of the struggle of the working class. Now which party is in the forefront of the struggle of the working class at this present time? More or less to me it's the BPP. If you want to argue about that, I can find all types of arguments to prove it. And the way I see it, I'm not against the development of the bi-national party; if it comes about, good. It's okay. But what I am for, right now, is to build that revolutionary nationalist party.

If you can recruit, when mass radicalization begins to take place, in another section of the population, good and well. But at the present time, there won't be any mass recruitment [to the YSA] of black students from the campuses. And this will be more so because of the Black Panthers in this city. Because they will tend to recruit the best students on campus. Which will be proven in the coming months. Then, if you recruit a few people who are fairly good if these people can't find an area where they can be involved in something that is going on in the West Side, or the South Side, with the Panthers, or any other militant organization, they will soon drop out. Because what black people need less of, is intellectuals. If we want black intellectuals, we can get some from Northwestern, or Roosevelt, where you have a whole lot of them. What we need is fighters.

I didn't drop out of the YSA and SWP because of pressure from anyone. I don't make any decisions that way; I make decisions on a political basis. I see the Panthers as being the most important organization at the present time. And I think it should be built. That's how I make decisions.

Ellis made a comment that we could talk about something else; like we could talk about Chairman Mao and the cultural revolution in China instead of the Panther Party. The reason you don't talk about Chairman Mao is because it's not politically important to talk about Chairman Mao, and the cultural revolution at this time.

Why talk about that? No one's interested in the cultural revolution except a few Maoists. But what people are interested in is the Black Panther Party. It's an important political development. So, you write about it. That's the only reason you write about it. People don't write about it because of pressure; they write about it because it's important. That's how people make their decisions.

And as far as the campus is concerned, we hope to work fairly close with the YSA. That'll probably be the only white organization that we'll work fairly close with. Probably, because there's nothing else on campus to work with. You can't work with SDS, and you certainly can't work with PL. If we can't work with YSA, we can't work with anyone, and that'll be a whole different thing. But as far as pressure is concerned, I don't make any decisions on that basis. It's whether or not I see the Panthers as being important. When I see the Panthers as reaching the people that need to be reached, the people that the SWP won't be able to reach for a long time. And those are the people that black Marxists who are serious have got to consider reaching. If you can't reach those people, then we can forget about the revolution.

Richard Hill (youth national committee, branch organizer): I think we've had a pretty full discussion and I think that what Wilbert said at the end lays out the important differences, and the reason why the Exec recommends that we should accept his resignation from the SWP.

The thread that's come through this discussion is the basic disagreement over where the revolutionary leadership will be built, over whether the building of the SWP on a consistent basis, with consistent work, over a period of developing struggles in the working class, whether the building of that party is the most important task of revolutionary Marxists. It's very important and basic to the program of the Socialist Workers Party that that difference be clear.

Within the working class movement on a world scale there are three main tendencies -- the Stalinists, the Social Democracy and the Trotskyists, that is the revolutionary Marxists. Every emergent revolutionary tendency has to consider where it stands regarding these three main groupings. And we take a very clear and principled position on which grouping we feel is that revolutionary Marxist grouping through which we will be able to lead the revolution in this country. We're very clear that the SWP will be that organization, and it's our task to build it as that organization.

All along the development of a revolutionary party differences develop due to different evaluations and although we don't welcome resignations, splits, and people dropping out of the party, we recognize that these things happen. But the continuity of the party has to go on. We hope to be able to collaborate with Wilbert and the BPP, that's our perspective, and we hope that it works out. We see no reason why it shouldn't. But the differences are really

such that the only realistic and politically correct thing that we can do is to accept his resignation from the party and hope to develop collaborative relationships with him and with the BPP over a period of time, recognizing that our perspective is to develop revolutionary Marxist cadre within the SWP and to work closely with any revolutionary organizations which develop.